



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,809	01/22/2002	Bernard A. Traversat	5681-06900	9617
58467	7590	09/18/2008		
MHKKG/SUN				
P.O. BOX 398				
AUSTIN, TX 78767				
EXAMINER				
DOAN, DUYEN MY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/054,809

Applicant(s)

TRAVERSAT ET AL.

Examiner

DUYEN M. DOAN

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-111 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-26, 28-52, 54-61, 63-81, 83-96, 98-100 and 102-111 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 27, 53, 62, 82, 97 and 101 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing Review (PTO-848)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response the submission filed on 6/24/2008.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see remark page 26, filed 6/24/2008 with respect to 112 2nd rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 112 2nd rejections of claims 1-24 has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's argument that the prior art does not disclose, "resources include other peers", examiner disagrees, Beck teaches the service descriptor for the remote service includes other peers information such as address and port (see Beck col.7, lines 45-63).

In response to applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach, "broadcast query message..." examiner disagrees, Beck teaches the device acting as a service advertiser query resources that available on other devices (see Beck col.7, lines 63-67 to col.8, lines 1-6), this equivalent to broadcast query message.

In response to applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach, "device independent language", however applicant specification does not provide a specific definition of what is a device independent language, Beck teaches the language independent concept that the implementation can be written in any language.

In response to applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach "peer advertisement for each of peers" examiner disagrees, firstly, peer advertisement simply include two things, the identification and the communication address, Beck-Lynch

teaches each node that advertise the service to other nodes also include the address and the identification of the node, therefore the combination of Beck-Lynch teaches the peer advertisement for each peers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 25-26, 28-38, 79, 81, 83-85, 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beck et al (us pat 6,604,140) (hereinafter Beck).

As regarding claim 25, Beck discloses a peer node, comprising: a processor (see Beck col.3, lines 48-52, the processor is inherent in the mobile device); a port operable to couple the peer node to a network (see Beck col.3, lines 48-52, port is inherently exist in order for the node to connect to the network); and a memory operable to store program instructions, wherein the program. instructions are executable by the processor to (see Beck col.3, lines 48-52, memory is inherent in the device): discover advertisements for resources in a peer-to-peer network, wherein each resource

advertisement comprises an identification of a corresponding resource and an indication of how to access the corresponding resource (see Beck col.4, lines 45-51, advertiser in each device create a service descriptor, which includes service name, and the location of the code that implement the service); and access said resources corresponding to said advertisements as indicated in said advertisements (see Beck col.8, line 32); wherein said resource include other peer nodes in the peer-to-peer network, and wherein said advertisements include peer advertisement corresponding to the to the other peer node (see Beck col.7, lines 45-67 , service also include information about remote node information such as IP address and TCP port).

As regarding claim 26, Beck discloses wherein said resources include one or more of, peer groups, content, service classes, services, pipes, and pipe endpoints (see Beck col.4, lines 31-39).

As regarding claim 28, Beck discloses broadcast to other peer nodes a discovery query message specifying a type of resource (see Beck col.8, lines 16-24, service lookup); and receive in response to said discovery query message one or more advertisements for the desired type of resource (see Beck col.8, lines 16-24, service registration).

As regarding claim 29, Beck discloses wherein the program instructions are further executable to: discover a peer advertisement corresponding to another peer node, wherein said peer advertisement comprises a pipe endpoint advertisement including an indication of a transport protocol; and communicate with said other peer

node upon receiving said other peer node's peer advertisement (see Beck col. 7, lines 45-48, IP address and the TCP port).

As regarding claim 30, Beck discloses wherein said communicating, the program instructions are further executable to send messages to a communication address comprised by said pipe endpoint advertisement in accordance with the transport protocol indicated by said pipe endpoint advertisement (see Beck col. 7, lines 45-48, IP address and the TCP port).

As regarding claim 31, Beck discloses in said communicating, the program instructions are further executable to receive messages from a communication address comprised by said pipe endpoint advertisement in accordance with the transport protocol indicated by said pipe endpoint advertisement (see Beck col. 7, lines 45-48, IP address and the TCP).

As regarding claim 32, Beck discloses wherein the resources include services, wherein the program instructions are further executable to access a service upon receiving said service's corresponding service advertisement (see Beck col.4, lines 31-39).

As regarding claim 33, Beck discloses wherein the resources include service classes, wherein the program instructions are further executable to discover a service class advertisement, wherein said service class advertisement comprises one or more service implementation advertisements, and wherein each service implementation advertisement describes a corresponding service implementation for a different platform type (see Beck col.3, lines 38-41; col.7, lines 49-54).

As regarding claim 34, Beck discloses wherein the program instructions are further executable to access one of the service implementations for the peer node's platform type described by one of the one or more service implementation advertisements (see Beck col.3, lines 38-41; col.7, lines 49-54).

As regarding claim 35, Beck discloses wherein the service implementations include a Java implementation (see Beck col.7, lines 57).

As regarding claim 36, Beck discloses wherein the service implementations include a native code implementation (see Beck col.6, lines 63-65).

As regarding claim 37, Beck discloses wherein the resources include services, wherein, the peer node is implemented on a computing platform and wherein a particular service of the one or more discovered services is implemented on a different computing platform from the computing platform, wherein the service advertisement for the particular service specifies a platform-independent method for accessing the particular service to activate the particular service(see Beck col.3, lines 38-42, mobile computing device and non-mobile computing device).

As regarding claim 38, Beck discloses wherein the resources include peers, wherein peer advertisements corresponding to the peers each comprise security credentials, and wherein the program instructions are further executable to authenticate a different peer node within the peer-to-peer network using a security credential from a peer advertisement corresponding to the different peer node (see Beck col.8, lines 31-37).

As regarding claim 79, Beck discloses a method for discovering resources in a peer-to-peer network, the method comprising:

a peer node broadcasting a discovery query message specifying a type of resource on the network (see Beck col.4, lines 40-54; also see col.8, lines 16-25, send a request for the service); and

the peer node receiving one or more advertisements for the specified type of resource in response to said discovery query message (see Beck col.8, lines 49-54);

wherein each advertisement is a programming language independent metadata document formatted in accordance with a peer-to-peer protocol (see Beck col.7, line 57).

As regarding claim 81, Beck discloses wherein the discovery query message specifies peer nodes as the resource type (see Beck col.4, lines 40-51).

As regarding claim 83, Beck discloses the query discovery message specifies content as the resource type (see Beck col.4, lines 40-51).

As regarding claim 84, Beck discloses the query discovery message specifies pipes as the resource type (see Beck col.4, lines 40-51).

As regarding claim 85, Beck discloses the query discovery message specifies pipe endpoints as the resource type (see Beck col.4, lines 40-51).

As regarding claim 87, Beck discloses wherein the resource type specifies one of a peer node, a peer group, a pipe, a pipe endpoint, content, or a service (see Beck col.4, lines 40-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 9-21, 39-46, 48-52, 55-61, 63, 65-76, 88-95, 98-100, 102-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck et al (us pat 6,604,140) (hereinafter Beck) in view of Lynch (us pat 6,487,600).

As regarding claim 1, Beck discloses a peer-to-peer network system, comprising: a plurality of peers, wherein each peer comprises a network node configured to communicate with one or more other ones of said peers over one or more networks (see fig.1, device 1 and device 2 are communicate with each other in a network 103);

a plurality of peer services or content provided by one or more of said peers (see Beck col.4, lines 10-17, each of the device 1 and device 2 advertises or uses the services); and a service or content advertisement for each of said services or content (see Beck col.4, lines 10-17, advertise the services), wherein each service or content advertisement comprises an identification of a corresponding service or content and an

indication of how to access the corresponding service or content (see Beck col.4, lines 45-51, advertiser in each device create a service descriptor, which includes service name, and the location of the code that implement the service); Beck further discloses a peer advertisement for each of the nodes, wherein the peer advertisement comprises the communication address for example the IP address and the TCP port (see Beck col.7, lines 46-47).

However, Beck does not disclose an identification of the peer node.

Lynch teaches an identification of the peer node (see Lynch col.23, lines 54-56, also see figure.13, peer ID and the corresponding IP address).

I would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lynch to the system of Beck to include the peer ID for the purpose of identifying and distinguishing one peer node with the other peer node.

As regarding claim 2, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein each peer advertisement is programming language independent metadata document providing information about one of said peers (see Beck col.2, lines 54, Java).

As regarding claim 3, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one or more of said peer advertisements further comprises an indication of a service or content provided by the peer corresponding to that peer advertisement (see Beck see col.7, lines 45-48, service advertisement also include the location of the device that advertise the service).

As regarding claim 4, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein said indication of a service or content comprises one of said service or content advertisements (see Beck see col.7,

lines 45-48, service advertisement also include the location of the device that advertise the service).

As regarding claim 5, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein each of said peer advertisements further comprises an endpoint advertisement, wherein said endpoint advertisement specifies said communication address for the corresponding peer and a transport protocol for the corresponding peer (see Beck col. 7, lines 45-48, IP address and the TCP port).

As regarding claim 9, Beck-Lynch discloses one or more of said peers are configured to discover one or more of said peer, service or content advertisements in order to locate other peers, services or content in the peer-to-peer network system (see Beck col.7, lines 22-25, discover the service on the remote computer).

As regarding claim 10, Beck-Lynch discloses send a discovery query message specifying a desired type of advertisement; and receives one or more advertisements in response to said discovery query message (see Beck col.8, lines 16-25).

As regarding claim 11, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one or more of said peers are configured to publish their corresponding peer advertisements in the peer-to-peer network system to be discoverable by other peers (see Beck col.4, lines 61-67, the services multicast over the network and to be discover by other nodes).

As regarding claim 12, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one or more of said peers are configured to publish one or more of said service or content advertisements in the peer-to-peer network system to be discoverable by other peers (see Beck col.4, lines 61-67, the services multicast over the network and to be discover by other nodes).

As regarding claim 13, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein each said peer advertisement and each said service or content advertisement is formatted according to a markup language schema defining elements of each type of advertisement (see Lynch col.24, lines 63). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 13.

As regarding claim 14, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein said plurality of peer services or content comprises a first service and a plurality of different implementations of said first service for different platform types (see Beck col.4, lines 24-30).

As regarding claim 15, Beck-Lynch discloses a service class advertisement describing said first service and a service implementation advertisement for each implementation of said first service wherein each service implementation advertisement describes a corresponding one of said implementations of said first service (see Beck col.4, lines 45-51).

As regarding claim 16, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one of said peers is configured to use an implementation of said first service supported by that peer's platform (see Beck col.4, lines 45-51).

As regarding claim 17, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one of said implementations of said service is a Java implementation and another one of said implementations of said service is a native code implementation (see Beck col.2, lines 54, Java, also see col.6, lines 63-66).

As regarding claim 18, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein a first peer of said plurality of peers is implemented according to a first computing platform and wherein a

first service of said plurality of services or content is implemented according to a second computing platform different from said first computing platform, wherein the corresponding service advertisement for said first service specifies a platform-independent method for accessing said first service so that said first peer can activate said first service (see Beck col.38-42, mobile computing device and non-mobile computing device).

As regarding claim 19, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one or more of said service or content advertisements comprises a time-to-live indicator, wherein the corresponding advertisement is deleted or invalidated when the time-to-live indicator expires (see Beck col.5, lines 19-25, service advertisement associate with expiration of period of validity).

As regarding claim 20, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein said time-to-live indicator is decremented to reflect a current time-to-live when the corresponding advertisement is provided to another peer (see Beck col.5, lines 19-25).

As regarding claim 21, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein one or more of said peer advertisements comprises a security credential for authenticating the corresponding peer (see Beck col.8, lines 31-37, security policy).

As regarding claim 39, limitations of claim 39 are similar to the rejected claim 1, the combination of Beck-Lynch further discloses a processor (see Beck col.3, lines 48-52, the processor is inherent in the mobile device); a port operable to couple the peer node to a network (see Beck col.3, lines 48-52, port is inherently exist in order for the node to connect to the network); and a memory operable to store program instructions,

wherein the program instructions are executable by the processor to (see Beck col.3, lines 48-52, memory is inherent in the device); a pipe endpoint advertisement indicating where to send messages to the peer node (see Beck col. 7, lines 45-48, IP address and the TCP port); one or more service advertisements, wherein each service advertisement corresponds to one of the one or more services instantiated on the peer node, and wherein each service advertisement indicates a mechanism for other peer nodes on the network to access the corresponding service (see Beck col.4, lines 45-51).

As regarding claim 40, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein the program instructions are further executable to publish the peer advertisement on the network, wherein said publishing makes the peer advertisement available for discovery by other peer nodes on the network (see Beck col.4, lines 61-67, advertise the service for other nodes in the network to discover).

As regarding claim 41, Beck-Lynch discloses receive a discovery query message including one or more criteria describing a resource, wherein the discovery query message is formatted in accordance with a discovery protocol (see Beck col.4, lines 61-67); and send a response message in response to the discovery query message including one or more advertisements of resources that match the one or more criteria, wherein each of said one or more resource advertisements includes a description of how to access the corresponding resource, wherein the response message is formatted in accordance with the discovery protocol (see Beck col.8, lines 16-27).

As regarding claim 42, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein the resource is the peer

node or another peer node (see Beck col.7, lines 26-41).

As regarding claim 43, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein the resource is at least one of the one or more services or one or more other services (see Beck col.7, lines 26-41).

As regarding claim 44, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein the resource is content (see Beck col.7, lines 26-41).

As regarding claim 45, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein the resource is a pipe (see Beck col.7, lines 26-41).

As regarding claim 46, Beck-Lynch discloses wherein the resource is the pipe endpoint (see Beck col.7, lines 26-41).

As regarding claim 48, Beck-Lynch discloses send the peer advertisement to one or more other peer nodes on the network (see Beck col.8, lines 49-54).

As regarding claim 49, Beck-Lynch discloses end the peer advertisement to one or more rendezvous peers on the network, wherein the one or more rendezvous peers are configured to cache advertisements for discovery on the network (see Beck col.8, lines 49-54).

As regarding claims 50-52, 55-56, the limitations of claim 50-52, 55-56 are similar to limitations of claims 1-5, 9-21, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-5, 9-21.

As regarding claims 57-61, 63, 65-76, the limitations of claims 57-61, 63, 65-76 are similar to limitations of claims 1-5, 9-21, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-5, 9-21.

As regarding claims 88-93, the limitations of claims 88-93 are similar to limitations of claims 1-5, 9-21, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-5, 9-21.

As regarding claims 94-95, 98-99, the limitations of claims 94-95, 98-99 are similar to limitations of claims 1-5, 9-21, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-5, 9-21.

As regarding claims 100, 102-111, the limitations of claims 100, 102-111 are similar to limitations of claims 1-5, 9-21, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-5, 9-21.

Claims 8, 54, 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck and Lynch as applied to claims 1, 50, 57 above, and further in view of Borella et al (us pat 6,269,099) (hereinafter Borella).

As regarding claim 8, 54, 64 Beck and Lynch discloses the invention as claimed in claims 1, 50, 57 and further discloses wherein said plurality of peer services or content comprises a plurality of peer services, each corresponding service advertisement comprises a pipe advertisement (see Beck col.4, lines 40-54).

However the combination of Beck-Lynch does not specifically teach a communication channel on which to send one or more message.

Borella teaches a concept of having communication channel on which to send one or more messages (see Borella col.7, lines 36-51, flow channel between peers).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Borella to the combination of Beck-Lynch to include a communication channel which to send messages for the purpose of allowing the communication between peers.

Claims 22-24, 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck and Lynch as applied to claims 1, 57 above, and further in view of Norris et al (us pat 6,754,678) (hereinafter Norris).

As regarding claim 22, Beck-Lynch discloses the invention as claimed in claim 1 above.

However, the combination of Beck-Lynch does not specifically disclose wherein the security credential for authenticating is a public key signature.

Norris teaches the security credential for authenticating is the public key signature (see Norris col.6, lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Norris to the combination of Beck-Lynch to use public key for authentication for the purpose of ensuring the trust in communication between peers (see Norris col.6, lines 1-6).

As regarding claim 23, Beck-Lynch-Norris discloses one or more peers of the plurality of peers are configured to authenticate the security credentials comprised by peer advertisements (see Norris col.6, lines 1-12).

As regarding claim 24, Beck-Lynch-Norris discloses wherein one or more peers are configured to confirm that the identification and security credential comprised by a particular peer advertisement indicate the same peer to authenticate each of the plurality of peers.

As regarding claims 77-78, limitations of claims 77-78 are similar to limitations of rejected claims 22-24, therefore rejected for the same rationale.

Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck in view of what was well known in the art.

As regarding claim 80, Beck discloses the invention as claimed in claim 79. However, Beck does not disclose using XML.

Official Notice is taken (see MPEP 2144.03) using XML is well known at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use XML with Beck, because XML offer great flexibility in organizing and representing information.

Claim 96 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck and Lynch as applied to claim 94 above and further in view of what was well known in the art.

As regarding claim 96, Beck discloses the invention as claimed in claim 94.

However, Beck does not disclose using XML.

Official Notice is taken (see MPEP 2144.03) using XML is well known at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use XML with Beck-Lynch, because XML offer great flexibility in organizing and representing information.

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck and Lynch as applied to claim 39 above and further in view of Periasamy et al (us pat 5,537,526) (hereinafter Peri).

As regarding claim 47, Beck and Lynch disclose the invention as claimed in claim 39 above.

However the combination of Beck-Lynch does not disclose peer group.

Peri teaches a peer group (see Peri col.2, lines 53-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Peri to the combination of Beck-Lynch to have a peer group for the purpose of reducing the amount of explorer traffic in the network (see Peri col.2, lines 44-45).

Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck in view of Periasamy et al (us pat 5,537,526) (hereinafter Peri).

As regarding claim 86, Beck discloses the invention as claimed in claim 79 above.

However the combination of Beck does not disclose peer group.

Peri teaches a peer group (see Peri col.2, lines 53-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Peri to the combination of Beck to have a peer group for the purpose of reducing the amount of explorer traffic in the network (see Peri col.2, lines 44-45).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-7, 27, 53, 62, 82, 97 and 101 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUYEN M. DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. M. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152

/Bunjod Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152